DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Special Meeting Thursday, March 22, 2018 | 4:30 pm

Flagstaff City Hall, Staff Conference Room 211 West Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Mark Haughwout, chair Kim Austin Jeff Goulden Estella Hollander

Members absent:

Susan Hueftle Matthew Mitchell Margaret Penado

The following City and agency staff was present:

Martin Ince, Multimodal Transportation Planner

Public present:

Jack Welch

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

There were no Announcements.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

II. OLD BUSINESS

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Pedestrian-bicycle project funding in transportation tax renewal recommendation

Mr. Ince provided information regarding the Citizens Transportation Tax Commission's recommendation to the City Council, which was discussed by the Committee:

- The Committee wondered why the funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects was reduced in the final recommendation to the City Council.
- There was a discussion about the traffic benefits of widening Lone Tree Road and building a bridge over the railroad tracks. The bridge may have some benefits, but the cost is very high.
- When streets are widened, they should include FUTS trails where they are planned.
- The Committee discussed the possibility that money would be taken from pedestrian and bicycle projects to cover shortfalls in funding for road projects.
- There is a concern that widening Lone Tree Road will make it high-speed and high-volume roadway that will not be comfortable for bicyclists, much like Butler Avenue is now.
- The language of the ballot measure should be specific to dedicate funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects, so it cannot be used for other roadway projects.
- There is a concern that widening roads does not alleviate congestion.
- The Committee discussed trade-offs between combining or separating projects into one or several questions. It may be necessary to keep the Lone Tree bridge question separate, or there will be a risk that a combined question will not be approved by the voters.
- The Committee wondered about potential competition from other tax and financing questions on the same ballot.

The Committee indicated a desire to share its thoughts about the recommendation in a letter from the BAC to the City Council, and discussed considerations that should be included in the letter:

- Recommended that the ballot measure language specify that funding be dedicated solely to pedestrian and bicycle projects.
- The amount dedicated for pedestrian and bicycle projects should not be used to fund pedestrian and bicycle components of other roadway projects. For example, the funding should not be used for sidewalks, bike lanes, or FUTS trials that would otherwise already be part of the street design.
- The \$29 million for pedestrian and bicycle projects is not enough.
- The letter should acknowledge the work of the Committee.
- The City cannot anticipate that there will be federal funding available in the future for pedestrian and bicycle projects.
- Walking and biking are important to the community.
- Pedestrian and bicycle crashes impose a significant cost on the community.
- Accommodating pedestrians and bicyclists make travel better for all roadways users; crashes are reduced and it helps reduce congestion.
- Previous community surveys show strong support for walking and biking.
- The City's regional plan and high occupancy housing plan encourage dense, compact, infill development; and there is an expectation that this land use pattern will encourage more people to walk and bike. However, we need to provide adequate facilities to make walking and biking better options for travel.
- Wider roadways induce additional demand for driving, while better biking facilities encourage more people to ride.
- Many residents would ride more if they felt safer, which can be accomplished by buffered or separated bike lanes, FUTS trails, and other facilities that separate cyclists from traffic. These facilities cost money. They don't have to be provided everywhere, but should be in a few key locations.
- A complete, connected bicycle network is critical.
- A strong selling point is the fact that additional bicycling directly reduces the number of vehicles on roads. More funding for walking and biking produces more attractive facilities, which results in more people walking and biking, which equates to fewer cars on the road.
- Much of Flagstaff's growth in the near future will be NAU students, who are more likely to walk and bike and not have a car. Accommodating students who want

to walk and bike is a crucial to mitigating the traffic impacts of growth of the NAU campus.

Promotion walking and biking is more equitable. Recommended pedestrian and bicycle facilities are located in all neighborhoods, whereas roadway facilities benefit only a few neighborhoods. Car-oriented projects only address the segment of the population that can afford to drive; but we know a significant part of the population does not drive for economic reasons.

Mr. Haughwout made, and Mr. Goulden seconded, a motion to forward a letter to the City Council that expresses these ideas regarding the recommendations of the Citizens Transportation Tax Commission. The motion was approved unanimously (4-0).

The Committee indicated that the letter should be as direct and brief as possible, even using bullet points to get the message across. The main point of the letter is to express that the CTTC's recommendation underfunds pedestrian and bicycle needs, and that additional funding should be provided through the tax.

Mr. Ince said he would draft a letter from the BAC for the Chair's signature.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

There were no Reports.

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm